

this will not require a lengthy debate. It is now eight minutes after eleven, and I would like to be able to go to Final Reading before the noon hour. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schmit. Thank you. Discussion on the Labeledz-Schmit motion? Senator Chambers, followed by Senators McFarland and Pirsch.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, now we've cut through the fat and we're down to the muscle and the bone. Nothing else can be cut away that is superfluous. We are casting a vote of substance now. Procedure is over, this is a substantive vote. There are two camps into which people can be divided; those who say that this is not a good method of legislating, and I'm in that camp, I believe that. This is not a wise move. The bills are very controversial, all of them are substantive. They, if enacted, would affect, in a very dramatic way, the lives of a considerable number of the citizens in this state. To advance them all with no debate, no amendments is very irresponsible. It's not illegal, but it's irresponsible. And it is other things, too. But when it comes to those other things, each person has to decide, based on what his or her conscience tells him or her, how that vote can be cast. But there is no way anybody can vote for these bills and say they're not voting for the bills. You all know the position I have stated repeatedly about my belief in a woman's right to make a choice as to whether or not she's going to carry a pregnancy to term. How can I vote for LB 854 and say that's my position? I'm against waiting periods. I'm against the bizarre descriptions of fetal development that are supposed to be given to a woman when she's facing this very critical decision. I'm against all that, so how can I vote to move LB 854 without any discussion, without any amendment? So that would be enough to stop me, if it was the only controversial bill in the pack, but it's not. There are other bills. If these were not controversial bills, they would have been on the consent calendar. Which bill on there could make it to the consent calendar? Not one. So we're not dealing with that. We are at that point in the session where a lot of things have been linked and woven together. If you do this, then I'll do that, if you don't do this, then I won't do that. Despite what Senator Schmit said earlier, I have not cast a vote against anybody's bill because of the way I feel about that person, Senator Schmit. I never have. There are votes that I have supported when I wished that I could vote against it, and then tell the person I voted against the bill because of